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Nature of “Double Track” approach in Asia-Pacific Security and its challenges

Security impact of the end of the Cold War has, so far, been far more profound in Europe than in the Asia Pacific region. While the nature of security institutions in Europe have undergone fundamental changes, comparable changes have not yet to reach Asia. On the alliance, the NATO has transformed both its membership and functions by virtually diminishing its East-West border, and deciding to adopt far-reaching decision on the alliance’s role of the future including the creation of cutting-edge NATO Responsive Force (NRF) at the NATO Summit in November 2002. In contrast, the core function of the alliance in East Asia, the Japan-US alliance, has although developed its concept, roles and missions to adjust to the post-cold war environment, the basic structure of the bilateral alliance networks based on ‘hub-spokes’ model created during the Cold War remains the same.

On the multilateral security, the enhanced European multilateral effort took place especially in forms of Common European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) within EU, including the establishment of the military committee, and the creation of a European Rapid Reaction Force (RRF) by 2003. In Asia, the comparable development could hardly be imaginable well into the near future. The ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), the major multilateral security forum in this region, is a forum for ‘cooperative security,’ entitled to enhance confidence among nations through dialogues and exchanges, and has only started its effort to seek for promoting the preventive diplomacy.

Within the structural outlook that the alliance serves as a ‘linchpin’ of security function, and the ‘limitation’ that has been labeled to the multilateral security forum like the ARF, the approach that the US and its allies had taken since 1995 was so-called “double
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1 See “Japan-US Joint Declaration on Security,” April 17, 1996.
track” approach. The alliance provide the core of the deterrence and response capability, and the multilateral security cooperation would only serve to compliment the alliance by helping to build comfort levels and create atmosphere conducive to cooperative security in the region\(^2\). The emphasis added carefully at the Pentagon’s East Asia Security Strategy report (EASR) that the multilateral security “does not substitute” the role of the alliance.\(^3\)

The recent developments in this region, however, pose several fundamental challenges to this “double track” approach. Following examples imply the potential that would not fit into a category of the decade-sustained approach. There are momentums to create more coordinated networks between US-led bilateral alliance, not by ‘hub and spokes’ but by ‘web-networks’. The Japan-US-South Korea Trilateral Coordination (TCOG) is a primary example. The US also emphasizes its importance to intensify the military cooperation with countries in Southeast Asia and Oceania, especially in the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Australia.

On the multilateral security, the 8th ARF in 2001 has adopted the document “Definitions and Principles of Preventive Diplomacy” as a basic platform to introduce further PD measures including the enhanced role of the ARF Chairman\(^4\). Defense officials’ exchange has also increasingly been flourished recent years even without the auspices of the ARF including among Defense Ministers assembled at the British International Institute of Strategic Studies (IISS) hosted “Shangri-la meeting” in May 2002. There are also emerging features of security cooperation in East Asia that do not necessary based on its geographical groupings but on its security concerns and capability, which leads the formation of “regional security complex\(^5\)” or new forms of the “coalition of the willing.” These multi-dimensional developments indicate that security cooperation in East Asia is far more complex today than a traditional bi-multi ‘double track’.

This paper reviews the emerging characteristics of the Asia-Pacific security, especially focusing the development of the ARF and the new features of the “coalition of


\(^{3}\) Ibid.


\(^{5}\) Patrick M. Morgan, “Regional Security Complexes and Regional Orders,” in David Lake and Patrick M. Morgan eds., Regional Orders: Building Security in a New World (The Pennsylvania State University Press, Pennsylvania, 1997) Lake and Morgan describe a region rather loosely, as a specific kind of region united by common security problems. In their terms of ‘regional security complex,’ the members do not have to be located in that neighborhood. This situation arises when the web of security relations and externalities embraces such a state in a clear and obvious fashion. Ibid., pp. 3-42.
the willing”. First, it analyzes the origins and the process the ARF heretofore, with regard to its achievements and limits. Second, it reviews the current ARF efforts to introduce further measures for preventive diplomacy. Finally, it provides the emerging feature of the framework of the “coalition of the willing” in Asia-Pacific, and how these security mechanisms could converge in the near future.

The Emergence of the ARF: a Product of the Low-profile Common Measure

After several years of gestation, the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) was formally launched in July 1994. The ARF was born in part as a rejection of a European model of security that is based on a combination of great-power politics and legalistic institutionalism. It was as early as in 1990 that Australia and, then Canada advocated a multilateral institutional structure in search of ‘common security’ in the Asia-Pacific along the lines of those in Europe (namely ‘CSCA’). In the early years, however, the US, Japan, ASEAN member-states, and China were skeptical, although in different context, about the viability of such multilateral security mechanisms in Asia.

In the early 1990s, these series of proposals reminded the legacy of the USSR advocacy of creating Asia-wide multilateral security mechanisms in mid-1980s. The US emphasized that, in response, it would not admit any arrangement that could lead to arms control in Pacific, where the strategic balance is based on the Air and Naval power. In contrast with European theater, the US forward deployed forces consisted mainly by the Pacific Fleet, that “there is no way to adequately redress the asymmetries between the land-based Soviet forces, with substantial long-range air assets, and the sea-based strengths the United States possess in Northeast Asia.” This bottom line also reflected as a negative response to earlier proposals on the ‘CSCA’ in 1990.

Skeptics of this proposal also contended that creating a region-wide security mechanism would be under the domination of the great powers. Especially, ASEAN member states concerned that such multilateral institutions would undermine their principle of Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality (ZOPFAN), which assumed to keep neutrality that ASEAN maintained since foundation, and avoid letting external powers to interfere the internal matters. Finally, they pointed out that the deterrence and balance of

6 John Garofano, “Flexibility or Irrelevance: Ways Forward for the ARF,” Contemporary Southeast Asia, Vol. 21, November 1, April 1999.
7 Most significant among these are “Vladivostok Speech” by President Mikhail Gorbachov in July 1986.
power approach had a relatively good track record of maintaining peace and stability.9

The security circumstance in Asia-Pacific, however, became more uncertain in early 1990s than above premises of maintaining the balance of power by the bilateral alliances. The closure of the US Philippines base in 1992 raised new concerns about the future of US involvement in the region. Regional powers such as China, India, and Japan were becoming stronger and more assertive. As super power military disengagement grew more credible option to be taken, the strategic debate was dominated by fears of a possible power vacuum and resulting competition and clashes among the regional powers. These concerns were compounded by the reemergence of a number of long-dormant territorial disputes, such as Spratly islands.10

Eventually, the very complexity and seriousness of these issues led a growing recognition of the need for an interregional institution to deal with security matters, or at least a regional forum where views could be exchanged and differences discussed reducing the chances of open conflicts. The experiments for this breakthrough actually came from Japanese Foreign Ministry in 1991, namely “Nakayama proposal,” which advocated that Asia-Pacific create ‘a sense of mutual reassurance.11’. The terminology ‘mutual reassurance measures’ (MRM) or ‘trust building measures’ (TBM) were carefully chosen, deliberately excluding the concept of confidence building, which Japan regarded as a process to be entered into only by adversaries12. The ASEAN Summit in January 1992 took a critical step in the direction proposed by Nakayama. It adopted a ‘Singapore Declaration’ of which to enhance political and security dialogue in ASEAN-PMC, the idea based on the creation of the ARF.

As the alternative to the European model, the ARF embraced the ‘ASEAN Way’ of dealing with conflicts of interest through discussion and dialogue to seek out the matter of acceptable to all involved parties. In the creation process of the ARF, the ‘ASEAN Way’ could have been an only model that could engage all concerned major powers into a single forum. The US, especially after the Clinton Administration in 1993, started to see the multilateral security dialogue as a complement to its bilateral alliance networks as long as it does not impede the forward-deployed strategy. China’s support on the idea of the
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10 Ibid.
12 Yukio Sato, et.al.
ARF from late 1993 was motivated based on the need to deal with the emerging ‘China Threat’ argument, and, as same context as the US with regard to the comfortableness, China had assumed that the ARF would not interfere their disputes (Taiwan Straits and Spratly) as long as the ‘ASEAN Way’ maintained. Without ASEAN sponsorship, Chinese participation in a regional multilateral security grouping would have been highly unlikely. For Japan, the ARF was a vehicle to foster a sense of trust, however fragile, on the basis of providing and sharing quality information about China, Japan, and the US, without undermining the existing security arrangements including Japan-US alliance. ASEAN, for its part, sponsored the ARF to ensure that its own position in the region would not be diminished by the establishment of a security institution, and because the ARF offered opportunities to advance the interests of the medium-powers.

Thus, from the founding process, the ARF had to take into account diverse interest and varied expectations while simultaneously attempting to produce discernible positive results. The ARF’s origins reflected not only an uncertain environment but also the multiplicity of security challenges. The ARF was conceived as process, not an institution. The objective was to create more predictable and stable pattern of relationships between major powers and Southeast Asia. These background of the circumstances in which the ARF came into existence should be kept clearly in mind when assessing its progress, limitations, and prospects for the future.

The ARF progress and Achievements

The Chairman’s statement at the first ARF meeting declared that the principal objective of the Forum was to “foster constructive dialogue and consultation on political and security issues of common interest and concern and to make significant contributions to efforts towards confidence building and preventive diplomacy in the Asia Pacific Region.” The second ARF meeting in 1995 set out the ARF’s “gradual evolutionary

16 John Garofano, et.al.
18 GVC Naidu, et.al.
approach” more explicitly into three stages in the Concept Paper. It begins with promoting confidence building measures at the Stage I, followed by the Stage II to develop preventive diplomacy mechanism and finally to develop mechanism for conflict resolution in Stage III.

Stage I: Promotion of Confidence-Building Measures
Stage II: Development of Preventive Diplomacy Mechanisms
Stage III: Development of Conflict-Resolution Mechanisms

Since its inception in 1994, the foundation of the ARF process is Stage I confidence-building, and a heart of the Stage I is transparency in military forces, defense posture, and overall intentions. The confidence-building measures have consisted largely of information sharing on a voluntary basis, and of meeting among regional defense officials. However, the ARF’s record of practical achievements in confidence building is quite patchy. Defense White Papers are promoted to publish among member states, but not so many have done so. There are entangling suspicion for the figure of the defense spending since no common standards on defense budget are introduced. The idea of regional arms register has stalled, instead, members are encouraged to participate in the UN Conventional Arms Register. There is no agreement on advanced notification of joint exercises conducted by the member states outside of their country.

It is clear, however, that the ARF has demonstrated its utility as a regional security enhancing its process in several ways. First, were it not for the ARF, this region would have been void of a framework for regional security. The ARF has provided the single most important security cooperative forum and has now developed to include all nations from the DPRK to India. The ARF is the only regional forum that discusses sensitive regional issues, such as the competing claims to the South China Sea as well as sensitive domestic issues such as the policies of the Myanmar regime. The forum has also provided an opportunity on the sidelines for exchanges of views on potential flashpoints such as Korean peninsula.

Second, the ARF has helped to enhance comfort levels and has created an atmosphere conducive to cooperative security in the region that has never been accustomed to cooperation on security related questions. The level of frankness has much
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deepened as seen in the recent discussions of the situations in the Korean Peninsula and the South China Sea. This has brought about mutual confidence as well as possibly gradual political, security convergence.

Third, many Track I and II activities have been pursued actively in such areas as piracy control and peace keeping operations. Through these activities officials and non-officials have increased mutual confidence as well as a sense of common interest and objectives in the field of security. A level of predictability has also been enhanced.

Fourth, in the field of preventive diplomacy, our region has achieved some progress, although very modest, in the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF).

**Evolution of Preventive Diplomacy (PD) in the ASEAN Regional Forum**

Cooperative security basically aims for the prevention of the conflict through enhanced exchanges and confidence building measures, which do not have effective means to manage conflicts, once it occurs. The nine year-old ARF has not take drastic initiatives to systemize its effort for the collective action toward such measures, mainly due to the sensitivity on the principle of non-interference of sovereign rights, claimed by various member states, notably China and Vietnam.

The ARF is now in the transitional phase to seek for the possible measures for Preventive Diplomacy. The 8th ARF ministerial meeting in 2001 has adopted three papers with consensus on the platform for preventive diplomacy, namely “Concept and Principles of Preventive Diplomacy,” “Enhanced Role of the ARF Chair,” and “Terms of Reference for the ARF Experts/ Eminent Persons” (APPENDIX 1, 2, 3). During the process of materialization of these papers, CSCAP as well as the other track-II meetings have played significant roles. Especially, the paper on “Concept and Principles of Preventive Diplomacy” was the product, which widely refer the CSCAP working definition created at the CSBM working group held in Bangkok in 1999. This shows how CSCAP has developed as the skillful body for the policy recommendation and has maintained the policy-relevance towards actual official process. (Also see attached Figure 1 for the Proposed PD measures in Track I and Track II)

The debates on the PD in the ARF, however, are taking very cautious steps. For example, its ‘definition’ aims at “helping to prevent disputes and conflicts from arising between States that could potentially pose a threat to regional peace and stability,” which limits the application of the PD function only to State-to-State conflict, not to include
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intra-State conflict\textsuperscript{25}. Its ‘principle’ also cautiously states that the PD measures should be 1) diplomatic, 2) non-coercive, and 3) respectful for sovereign equality, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of State. Within these definitions and principles, the ARF proponents are seeking the possibility to create concrete measures, especially the enhanced role of the ARF Chairman. The prospects for materializing these measures, however, are not promising, since the ARF “continue to develop at a pace that is comfortable to all participants and reaffirmed their commitment to make decisions by consensus\textsuperscript{26}.”

“Concept and the Principles of the Preventive Diplomacy” also has several shortfalls, such as putting on many conditions (principles) for preventive diplomacy measures to be taken. But this is also true that once we have agreed on the principle, attentions are paid to how we should consolidate the preventive diplomacy through proposing the actual ways and systems within its general framework that member states made with consensus.

On the \textbf{Role of ARF Chair}, the eight’s ARF meeting has approved its enhanced role particularly with regard to his liaison role with external partners for exchanging information. The role of the ARF Chair also includes “encouraging exchange of information and highlighting issues that can impact on regional security for consideration by the ARF by serving as a conduit for information sharing in between ARF meetings.” They also acknowledged that the ARF Chair could serve as a “focal point for consultation among ARF members.” The ARF Chair, with the consent of states involved may also “convene an ad hoc meeting of all members at an appropriate level.”

Ministers also acknowledged with regard to \textbf{Register of the ARF Experts / Eminent Persons (EEPs)} that the EEPs could provide non-binding and professional views or recommendation to the ARF participants. They can also serve as resource persons in ARF meetings regarding issues of their expertise. The ARF Chair or any ARF participant may propose to activate the EEPs for these tasks and such proposals are undertaken unless any objection from any other participants.

Considering the scope of the first two stages of the evolution starting with the promotion of CBMs to the development of preventive diplomacy, these agreements of the last ARF meeting could provide basis for the next step. ARF has been following the rules of informality, but now we have come to the stage to think about how the Forum is to be effective in terms of the consolidation of these measures.

\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Concepts and Principles of the Preventive Diplomacy}, Delivered at the Seventh ASEAN Regional Forum Ministerial Meeting, July 27, 2001. \url{http://www.aseansec.org/politics/arf7c.htm}

\textsuperscript{26} The 7\textsuperscript{th} ARF Chairman’s Statement, \url{http://www.aseansec.org/politics/pol_arf7.htm}
Early Warning: Next Step for the ARF

Preventive diplomacy needs to be proactive and necessitates timeliness to be effective in preventing conflict from arising or containing the spread of conflict in case it erupts. Therefore an early warning system to effectively gather information and provide analysis would be needed.

If armed conflict or political crisis are to be prevented, it is axiomatic that some system has to be put in place to provide early, timely warning of such situation’s imminence. While state-based early warning systems are, in nature, the responsibility of each of their security-related departments and agencies and responsible officers, the early warning systems of the international community are yet to be developed. The UN, regional organizations, and other cooperative security arrangements are just starting to try to enhance the functioning of such early warning systems on more-than-national basis.

Proposed measures for preventive diplomacy in the ARF context could be categorized in four stages (see Figure 1). When we look at the diagram of proposed measures and the adopted measures in the ARF process based on these four stages, it is clear that we are lacking the measures for the early warning mechanisms.

Strengthen and Widen the Scope of the Role of ARF-Chairman and the Experts/Eminent Persons’ Group (EEP)

The role of the ARF Chair would have to be crystallized to enable him/her to play an effective part in the early warning. Taking the examples of UN Secretary-General (UNSG) for an analogy, the UNSG is an office of eminence and trust. The exercise of Conflict Prevention, in UN’s term, arises from the duty of the office in keeping the Security Council advised. This provides a scope for the exercise of initiative and judgment. The need of the UNSG to report on a regular basis to the Security Council provides accountability.

As similar to the UN process, the ARF Chair should be able to take the initiative where thought necessary, while still being responsible to the interest and concerns of member states. In institutionalizing the process, the ASEAN-rotated ARF Chair should be shared with non-ASEAN member states in the coming future. As CSCAP co-Chairs are already shared with ASEAN and non-ASEAN member committees, it would be important to get all members to share the responsibility of its right. The EEPs could act as not only undertaking in-depth studies to serve as a resource persons but also to support enhanced roles of the ARF Chair by contacting closely with each other. This might lead to the discussion of setting the Special Representatives (SRs).
Appointing Special Representatives (SRs)

Special Representatives (SRs) will also be able to help build trust in the skill and impartiality of third parties such as the ARF in their practice of preventive diplomacy such as offering good offices and mediation before the onset of conflict or after conflict has erupted in order to prevent further escalation. SRs could undertake fact-finding missions, at the request of the parties involved, and to offer their good offices, as necessary. Such SRs could be appointed on an ad hoc basis as the need arose or a register of such persons might be maintained from which the governments concerned might draw.

Regional Risk Reduction Center (RRC)

Preventive diplomacy could only be efficacious when actors take a timely action. Whether this is possible depends on the existence of an early warning system based on institutional basis, which can effectively gather information and provide analysis to figure out the situation that are critical for regional security. While there is little doubt that it is important for ARF members to have good sources of information about the whole range of emerging threats, disputes, conflicts and other security crises, it should be entailed by the ARF’s ability to absorb the enormous amount of incoming information, analyze and apply it in a meaningful way.

At present, the ARF comprises an annual ministerial meeting, with a few inter-sessional meetings among senior officials. Although the officials among member states have contact points with one another, it is clear that the official schedules for these meetings are not quite adequate for early warning purposes. That might subsequently lead to a need for institutional-based system for the early warning. The Regional Risk Reduction Center, which has been the idea on the table since stated in the “Concept Paper” of the ARF back in 1995, should become one of the core planning of the next step to consolidate the regional early warning system.

Taking the ongoing examples, the OSCE’s Conflict Prevention Center and the Middle East Regional Security Center(s) both have a role to play in the early warning. As they have started from, the center could be generally tasked to gather and analyze information pertinent to the identification of conflict and report periodically to the ARF or the ARF SOM. It could provide an early warning function by alerting the ARF of possible

conflict in the early stages well before the question of coercion has arisen. Examples of activities would be information gathering, analysis and dissemination.

As the Australian Foreign Ministry has well sketched the idea in ARF-SOM in 1995, in the further stages, the center could serve as facilitation, mediation and monitoring and would be undertaken at the behest of individual member states affected. As part of this stage's activity the Center could develop to support the EEPs and Special Representatives, and then act as a resource and referral source which would match particular problems with skilled third parties acceptable to the parties to a dispute who could assist as mediators or conciliators.

**Bilateral-Multilateral Nexus in Asia-Pacific Security**

Since the birth of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) in 1994, one of the major security debates in this region has been how the ARF could practically consolidate its role as a multilateral security mechanism, within the nexus of bilateral security alliances. There have been remarkable discourses between the major powers, the US, Japan and China, on how you design this bi-multi nexus for their desired security architecture in this region.

There are at least three schools of thought on the nexus. The first school, mainly led by the conservative realist, argues that given the nature of the deterrence function, the only security model that could viably play is the alliance; while the multilateral security could only serve as, in their term, a ‘talk shop’. The second school, which is represented by Pentagon’s East Asian Strategy Report (EASR-1995) and is the majority view of the US and Japanese government officials would seek for a complementary role between two approaches. It defines the alliance as a core- and the multilateral security cooperation as a sub-function, which is to support the role of the alliance through building confidence among players in this region. There is also a third school, especially represented by China, which tries to downplay the role of the alliance in the post-cold war security environment and, from their official claims, the cooperative security is the best model to be pursued in this region, nevertheless with having many conditions that they can promote it.

This very rough sketch of discourse on the security approach in Asia has been actually a source of tension between Japan-US and China. On the bilateral side, China’s claims to oppose the alliance were highlighted during 1996 Joint Declaration and the
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29 Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, “Approaches to Peace Building and Preventive Diplomacy in the Asia-Pacific Region,” the paper prepared for submission to the ARF SOM in May 1995.

30 Ibid.
formulation new guideline process in 1997. Whereas the multilateral side, the ARF has been somewhat facing the stagnation of proceeding into stage-II Preventive Diplomacy, largely because of the reluctant behaviors by China and Vietnam.

Thus, it seems that there lacked a common approach to explore the nexus. However, the emerging following two aspects in international relations will have a potential of transforming effect toward this bilateral-multilateral nexus. One aspect is the effect of September 11. The other is the emerging new feature of multilateral security in East Asia, mainly led by the US CINCPAC that is called “web networks” security based on the “coalition of the willing.” These aspects might lead to a possibility for a new dimension of nexus into a strategic convergence between major powers to promote building cooperative security architecture.

Emerging Concepts: Bilaterally-Networked Multilateral Security

On ‘multilateral’ approach, there should be a strict distinction between two types of multilateral security for the analytical purpose. One is the Bilaterally-Networked Multilateral Security (expanded bilateralism), and the other is Multilateral Security Cooperation (enhanced multilateralism). The former based on the belief that the bilateralism would best serve, but it could be expanded multilaterally. For example, even if B and C are perceived to be friends, A will find the prospect of sustaining A-B and A-C ties more efficacious than forming A-B-C (multilateral) arrangement. In contrast, the latter argument refers to a broad spectrum of collective state behavior with an accompanying wide array of norms and principles.

Within the concept of Bilaterally-Networked Multilateral Security, Admiral Dennis Blair, ex-commander-in-chief of the US Pacific Command, advocated to create “security community” based on the “enriched bilateralism.” In order to share the peaceful change and diminish the prospect of using force, he believes, it is essential to develop regional, multilateral approach to common security challenges. In his mind, the most effective method is to develop policy coordination, including combined military

31 I owe this argument from the article of Brian L. Job, “Multilateralism in the Asia Pacific Region,” Discussion Paper Prepared for the 4th Workshop on the Bilateral System of Alliances in the Changing Environment of the Asia-Pacific, June 10-12, 1996, Japan Institute of International Affairs.
cooperation, on a particular regional security issue or series of related security issues. For that purpose, the armed forces of the US, in conjunction with allies and other partners in Asia, should undertake to enhance regional readiness for combined operations.

In year 2001, the U.S./Thai bilateral exercise ‘Cobra Gold’ was linked with two other existing traditional U.S. bilateral exercises – ‘Tandem Thrust’ (U.S./Australia) and ‘Balikatan’ (U.S./Philippines) -- into a joint combined exercise, ‘Team Challenge 01.’ The US Pacific Command and forces from Thailand, Australia, the Republic of the Philippines and Singapore participated and 22 countries have observed in this umbrella exercise during April and May 2001. The three traditional bilateral exercises remain separate exercises under the common regional exercise scenario of TC-01. U.S. Pacific Command and the participating nations are linking these existing exercises under TC-01 to improve readiness and interoperability, and to increase security within the Asia-Pacific region. The multilateral framework of TC-01 compliments the existing strong bilateral relationships throughout the region, and provides additional training and engagement opportunities.

TC-01 uses United Nations Chapter VII (peace enforcement), non-combatant evacuation operation and crisis management scenarios and will have two phases. Phase I provides Combined/Joint Task Forces (CJTF) training for maritime forces in exercise Tandem Thrust (U.S./Australia) with supporting participation by Canada. Phase II provides CJTF Training for maritime, air and army forces by linking Cobra Gold 01 (U.S./Thailand/ Singapore) with Balikatan (U.S./Philippines).

In addition to these joint training exercises, countries in Southeast Asia and Oceania have recently intensified the defense cooperation with the US34. Notable among these, Australia made the Sydney Statement also called Joint Communiqué of Australia-United States Ministerial Consultations on July 31, 1998. Apart from the extension of the treaty governing the Joint Defense Facility at Pine Gap, Australia's crucial role (known as US southern anchor) in the American East Asian strategy was reiterated and close collaboration in security issues was underscored.

Philippines’ signing of the Visiting Forces Agreement in January 1998 primarily deals with the legalities regarding the status of US troops while on official duties in the Philippines, its psychological import is much greater on the rest of the region, particularly in the light of the intensified contest for islands in the South China Sea where Manila too has claims35. Third, Singapore in early 1998 announced its decision to build a new large naval base called Changi Naval Station and that it will be available to US naval combatants

35 Ibid.
and include a pier which can accommodate an American aircraft carrier.

**Emerging Features of the “Coalitions of the Willing”**

These recent developments provide a hint of challenging the very nature of the multilateral security in Asia Pacific. The premise of the multilateral security by ‘multilateralism,’ such as the ARF, is based on ‘inclusiveness’ and equality, where countries in the ‘region’ are free to participate in the Forum. The membership of the regime is based on the existence in the region, not by its characteristics. ‘Engagement’ is the core principle for this type of multilateral cooperation by the inclusion of the states, as the ARF successfully engaged China, Russia, enlarged ASEAN, India and North Korea.

In contrast, the emerging feature of multilateral security does not necessarily adhere to this unequivocal inclusive nature. The formation of the cooperation framework is made up by the capability and the willingness of actors, so-called the “coalition of the willing.” Most of the existing coalitions have the principles of open memberships and do not exclude the future participation of non-member. But the tacit assumption of the “coalition of the willing” does not want the countries that are reluctant to cooperate within the framework, which somewhat virtually leads to the politics of exclusion.36

The primary benefit of the coalition of the willing is they could evolve the security cooperation with like-minded states to ensure the higher level of cooperation. It could be even regarded as a counter argument toward ‘inclusive region-based’ security cooperation like the ARF, which could not address vigorous developments for security cooperation as long as the ARF “continues to move at a pace comfortable to all ARF participants and on the basis of consensus.” Instead, the coalition of the willing will set up the higher degrees of cooperation without the interference of external actors, and invite them after the coalition has set up the agenda. This model provides new opportunities for security cooperation in Asia-Pacific, as a breakthrough for enhancing meaningful measures to be materialized.

**Multilateral Security Cooperation and the “China-factor”: A Search for ‘Strategic Convergence’**

How the developments and future prospects of the ARF, and the emerging features of the coalition of the willing merged in the Asia-Pacific? There is a case for ‘strategic convergence’ of these ideas, especially in context of dealing China-factor.
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The only potential that the ARF could viably address the role for the regional security, is to promote institutionalization by synthesizing the security concept of member states. For example, China's "New Security Concept" emphasizes multilateral effort, while criticizes the 'entangling alliance systems.' The 'new concept' refers an example of the CBMs between China and Russia on border issues and the "Shanghai-Five" (currently developed as the "Shanghai Security Organization") initiatives. Also, for the US, the ARF could serve as a complement framework of the alliance in more visible terms. If the low-intensity conflict, such as the case of East Timor, political crisis, and small-border conflict, could be dealt with autonomous framework in the Asia-Pacific Region, the US can refrain from over-commitment in regional affairs.

With this context, and as the only trigger, China would be able to participate vigorously and to promote the preventive diplomacy in the ARF. Unless China favors to take part in the process, the ASEAN countries will tend to rely more on the "Web networks" of security, actually excluding China. That will turn out to be the encircled US-led security system in whole East Asia. If China favors to try avoiding this situation, China inevitably join to create a more viable multilateral security mechanisms. I will argue that this might be a point of strategic convergence. This Strategic Convergence may help to create the more promising architecture for "Multi-Layered Security Network" in the Asia-Pacific Region.

However, China decided, for a first time, to send the observers to US-Thai military exercise Cobra-Gold in May 2002. According to a PLA military official that I interviewed, China has changed the principle of evaluating the US-led military cooperation from entire disagreements to selective agreements. He said, "China will no longer oppose to these military exercises even by the US, if the purpose of these exercises is non-traditional missions, such as peace keeping and disaster relief." He added, "This new principle is firm and will be appeared in the next Chinese Defense White Paper." This episode would have a profound implication of the possibility of the "coalition of the willing." This might be the symbolic case that the "coalition" has worked to set up the norms and cooperation level in advance, to invite China into the framework without lowering the agenda.

**Impact of the September 11 and the ARF process**

Finally with regard to the impact of September 11, the ARF member states have also come to notice that they were facing crucial security agendas that are untraditional.
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38 Interviewed to PLA officer at the international workshop in Kisarazu, Chiba, April 27, 2002.
and asymmetrical on the multilateral process. The ARF recalled the Statement of October 2001 issued by the ARF Chair on behalf of ARF participants and emphasised the need for the ARF to find ways and means to cooperate further in the fight against terrorism. The 9th ARF also reaffirmed the principles outlined in the relevant UNSC Resolutions related to the Prevention and Suppression of Terrorist Acts and expressed satisfaction that all participants had submitted their reports in compliance with UNSC Resolution 1373. They encouraged early accession to or ratification of relevant international Conventions and Protocols relating to terrorism.

The significant achievement of the 9th ARF regarding anti-terrorism effort was the establishment of an Inter-sessional Meeting on Counter-Terrorism and Transnational Crime (ISM on CT-TC) and noted a Concept Paper submitted by the United States and Malaysia would serve as a good basis for the work of the new ISM. They were of the view that enhanced cooperation against terrorism would further strengthen the ARF. They also noted the efforts by participants to promote cooperation to combat terrorism within the framework of the ARF, including the submission of Concept Papers on ARF Dossier on Counter-Terrorism Measures by Japan and on Cyber Terrorism by the Republic of Korea.

The 9th ARF commended regional and international efforts against terrorism, in particular: the Declaration by APEC Economic Leaders of October 2001 in Shanghai; the 7th ASEAN Summit Declaration of November 2001 on Joint Action to Counter Terrorism in Bandar Seri Begawan; the Declaration by the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation; the ASEAN +3 Leaders’ commitment to work together against terrorism at the 5th ASEAN +3 Summit 2001 and the Almaty Act and the Declaration on Eliminating Terrorism and Promoting Dialogue among Civilisation issued at the 1st Summit Meeting of the Conference on Interaction and Confidence Building Measures in Asia (CICA). The Work Programme on Terrorism was established by the Special ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Terrorism in Kuala Lumpur and the signing of the Agreement on Information Exchange and the Establishment of Communication Procedures among Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines on 7 May 2002.

On bilateral bases, the US-China cooperation on intelligence and diplomatic coordination during the Afghanistan campaign showed a great transformation of the bilateral security relations. And notably, China and South Korea is remaining very low key on the observation of Japanese expanded role of the Self Defense Force. Although this might not downplay the security importance of remaining tension in this region, this could be an opportunity to institutionalize the security cooperation in this region, from bundle of CBMs into more consolidated mechanisms.
### Figure 1: Proposed Measures for Preventive Diplomacy in Track I and Track II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st Category</th>
<th>Confidence Building Measures</th>
<th>2nd Category</th>
<th>Fact Finding Information Sharing</th>
<th>3rd Category</th>
<th>Early Warning</th>
<th>4th Category</th>
<th>Negotiation Mediation Arbitration Good Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRACK I</strong></td>
<td>ARF / ISG on CBM</td>
<td><strong>TRACK II</strong></td>
<td>ARF Seminar / CSCAP-CSBM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of Annual Security Outlook (A5, A6, A7)</td>
<td>Creation of Regional ‘Code of Conduct’ (S3)</td>
<td>Adoption of Asia Pacific Concord (C01)</td>
<td>Reflect the experience of China-India and China-Russia CBMs (S3)</td>
<td>Extended Military Meetings (C01)</td>
<td>Voluntary Report of Military related Activities (C99)</td>
<td>Establishment of Regional Peace-keeping Center (C01)</td>
<td>Enhanced Role of the ARF Chair (A5, A6, A7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Background Briefing on Regional Security Issues (A5, A6, A7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARF Information Research Center (S2, C99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARF Register of Eminent Persons (C99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort for Confidence Building (A7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARF Register of Experts (S2)</td>
<td>ARF Register of Experts (A5, A6, A7)</td>
<td>Special Representatives (A2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment of Conflict Prevention Center (S1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norms Building (A7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment of Regional Risk Reduction Center (A2)</td>
<td>Promotion of Regional Capability on Early Warning (S3)</td>
<td>ARF Information Research Center (S2, C99)</td>
<td>Establishment of Regional Risk Reduction Center (S2, C01)</td>
<td>Establishment of ARF Secretariat (C01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced Role of the ARF Chair (A5, A6, A7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARF Register of Experts/Eminent Persons (A5, A6, A7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARF Register of Experts/Eminent Persons (A5, A6, A7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment of Regional Risk Reduction Center (A2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Representatives (A2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Representatives/ Third group Mediation (S1, S2, S3, C97)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

(A) : ARF Ministerial Meeting and ISG (Number shows the xth meeting)

(S) : ARF Track II Seminar (Number shows xth meeting)

(C) : CSCAP (Number shows the year of the meeting)

Source: Ken Jimbo, “ARF and Preventive Diplomacy: Regionalization of the Concept”
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APPENDIX 1

SEVENTH ASEAN REGIONAL FORUM MINISTERIAL MEETING
27 July 2000 Bangkok, Thailand

CONCEPT AND PRINCIPLES OF PREVENTIVE DIPLOMACY

Introduction

1. The ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) was established by ASEAN in 1994 to maintain peace and stability in the region and to promote regional development and prosperity. It was recognised that rapid development in the regional and global environment had impacted on the security and strategic concerns of countries in the region. It was also acknowledged that the region was remarkably diverse, and that there remained challenges to regional peace and prosperity.

2. The ARF sought to meet these challenges by putting into place a three-stage process: Stage 1 on promotional Confidence Building Measures, Stage 2 on development of Preventive Diplomacy and Stage 3 on Elaboration of Approaches to Conflicts. It was generally recognised that the ARF would have to establish itself, over time, as a meaningful forum to enhance the peace and prosperity of the region. To do so, the ARF process would have to adopt a gradual evolutionary approach, decision-making by consensus and move at a pace comfortable to all its members in order to achieve its long-term objectives. Discussions should be aimed at enhancing mutual understanding and trust among the Asia-Pacific countries, furthering their dialogue and cooperation, and promoting peace, stability and prosperity in the region.

3. Much progress has been made over the past six years, a relative short time in the life of regional organisations. Constant interaction among Ministers and senior officials of the ARF members, and confidence building measures that have been initiated, have helped to build up comfort levels. This has allowed for discussions among ARF members to be candid and frank, thereby encouraging greater transparency, mutual trust and understanding of each other's concerns and positions. It was stressed that the confidence building would continue to be the main thrust of the whole ARF process, since it is impossible to move the ARF forward without a high degree of mutual understanding and trust among ARF participants.

4. Hence, at the 4th ARF, the Ministers instructed the ARF Intersessional Support
Group on Confidence Building Measures (ISG on CBMs) to identify areas in the overlap between CBMs and Preventive Diplomacy, and ways and means of addressing them while maintaining the focus on CBMs). In addressing the issue of overlap, a common understanding on a working concept of Preventive Diplomacy (PD) and the principles governing its practice is necessary to provide a common basis on which to explore this overlap and to enhance confidence in the process. Pursuant to this, the Ministers at the 6th ARF in Singapore instructed the ISG on CBMs to further explore the overlap between CBMs and PD, focusing *inter alia* on the development of the concepts and principles of PD.

**Definition Concept and Principles of PD by the ARF**

5. Agreement on the definition and, more importantly, a common understanding of the concept of PD and the principles governing the practice of PD, would be useful for further progress on the development of PD within the ARF. The definition of PD by ARF sets out very broad objectives, and the concept would serve as a guide as to the approach to take, while the principles would serve as a guide as to fundamental parameters for the practice of PD in the ARF.

6. The definition concept and principles of PD as agreed by ARF members are not legal obligations - They are shared perspectives that would apply only to the ARF and should be understood as representing the current status of an evolving consensus in the ARF as discussions continue. These discussions should be aimed at enhancing mutual understanding and trust among ARF members, take into account the actual conditions of the region and be consistent with basic principles, of international law and established APF processes.

**Definition of PD**

7. The definition of PD has proven to be controversial. However, there appears to be general consensus that PD is consensual diplomatic and political action taken by sovereign states with the consent of all directly involved parties:

- To help prevent disputes and conflicts from arising between States that could potentially pose a threat to regional peace and stability;

- To help prevent such disputes and conflicts from escalating into armed
confrontation; and

- To help minimise the impact of such disputes and conflicts on the region

**Concept of PD**

8. Much academic work has been done within this broad definition of PD, and various concepts have been suggested. We can view PD along a time-line in keeping with the objectives: to prevent disputes/conflicts between states from emerging, to prevent such disputes/conflicts from escalating into armed confrontation, and to prevent such disputes and conflicts from spreading. Some measures could be taken even before a crisis has actually arisen.

9. PD measures could include the following:

   **a. Confidence Building Efforts** i.e. efforts to build mutual trust and confidence between states. The successful application of PD has to be built upon continuous efforts to maintain and enhance trust and confidence. Without a high degree of trust among ARF participants, it is unlikely that PD in the later stages of any conflict can be carried out. While the ARF has succeeded in fostering dialogue among ARF members over the past few years, it is now time to look into strengthening the habit of cooperation. Cooperation among ARF members can preempt disputes as well as prevent disputes from developing into conflicts by enhancing trust and understanding.

   **b. Norms building** i.e. nurturing of accepted codes or norms of behaviour guiding the relationships among states in the Asia-Pacific region. To the extent that the codes enhance predictability and strengthen cooperative behaviour in ensuring regional peace, norms building enhances trust between and among states in the region. The ARF could consider measures in this area, such as developing a code of conduct governing relations among ARF members which is consistent with existing codes such as the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC) and the UN Charter.

   **c. Enhancing Channels of Communication:** open, easy and direct
communications or channels among ARF participants which serve to promote transparency with a view to avoid misperception or misunderstanding. Such channels would advance information-sharing, provide early warning and facilitate dialogue.

**d. Role of the ARF Chair** The ARF Chair could play a role as determined by ARF members.

10. At the onset of a crisis, further measures could be considered as appropriate. The ARF should continue to consider possible further measures with a view to reaching consensus on them.

**Principles of PD**

11. Principles to guide the practice of PD are necessary to increase understanding of the scope and mechanisms of the scope and mechanisms of PD and to provide consistency and reasonable expectations of the process. In formulating and applying these principles, it would be useful to draw on the approach that has contributed to ASEAN’s success and resilience. This includes the non-use of force in inter-state relations, the peaceful settlement of disputes, non-interference in the internal affairs of members, pragmatism, flexibility and consensus, consultation and accommodation.

12. The following are 8 key principles of PD, drawn mainly from discussions in CSCAP:

- It is about diplomacy. It relies on diplomatic and peaceful methods such as diplomacy, negotiation, enquiry, mediation, and conciliation.
- It is non-coercive. Military action or the uses of force are not part of PD.
- It should be timely. Action is to be preventive, rather than curative. PD methods are most effectively employed at an early stage of a dispute or crisis.
- It requires trust and confidence. PD can only be exercised successfully where there is a strong foundation of trust and confidence among the parties involved and when it is conducted on the basis of neutrality, justice and impartiality.
- It operates on the basis of consultation and consensus. Any PD effort can only
be carried out through consensus after careful and extensive consultations among ARF members, with due consideration for the need for timeliness.

- It is voluntary. PD practices are to be employed only at the request of all the parties directly involved in the dispute and with their clear consent.

- It applies to conflicts between and among States.

- It is conducted in accordance with universally recognized basic principles of international law and inter-state relations embodied, *inter alia*, in the UN Charter, the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence and the TAC. These include respect for sovereign equality, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of State.

**Conclusion**

13. The ARF’s process should progress at a pace comfortable to all members on the basis of consensus. A step-by-step approach is needed to ensure consensual progress in order to secure the maintenance and continuing enhancement of commitment of all participants in the ARF process. We should seek to proceed with the possible while keeping an eye on what can be done in the longer term. For the ARF to further develop, it is important to achieve a common understanding and consensus on the concept, definition and principles of PD.
Enhanced Role of the ARF Chair  
(Shared perspectives among the ARF members)

Objective
The 6th Senior Officials' Meeting (SOM) of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) in May 1999 agreed that the next ISG (1999-2000) would continue to explore the principles and procedures for an enhanced role for the ARF Chairman in good offices and co-ordination in between ARF meetings. The 6th Ministerial Meeting in July 1999 noted the common understandings reached on the four-tabled proposals relating to the overlap between CBMs and PD. These common understandings include the above agreement at the SOM.

Consistent with this request, the ARF ISG on CBMs of the 1999-2000 inter-sessional year at its meeting in Tokyo in November 1999 discussed these roles and agreed that such a role for the ARF Chairman in liaising with external parties should be further encouraged as far as it was carried out informally with prior consultation with all ARF members and their consent. The ARF ISG meeting in Singapore in April 2000 had a substantive exchange of views on this issue. The meeting agreed that the ARF Chair could serve as a useful conduit for information-sharing in between ARF meetings, and that members could utilise this on a voluntary basis.

The 7th Ministerial Meeting in July 2000 requested the ISG to continue its work in exploring the overlaps between CBMs and PD and strengthening the four CBM/PD overlap proposals already agreed upon, which include an enhanced role of the ARF Chair.

The aim of this paper is to help clarify and facilitate the ongoing discussions at the ISG on the Enhanced Role of the ARF Chair. The paper is mainly focused on the role of the ARF Chair in the CBM stage, and outlines principles and procedures that could serve as a basis for further discussions. These principles and procedures are shared perspectives that would apply only to the ARF and should be understood as representing the current status of an evolving consensus in the ARF as discussions continue.

1. Principles
In accordance with universally recognised basic principles of international law and inter-state relations embodied, inter alia, in the UN Charter, the Five Principles of
Peaceful Co-existence and the TAC, including respect for sovereign equality, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of a state, the Enhanced roles of the ARF Chair in good offices and co-ordination in between ARF meetings are aimed at enhancing mutual understanding and promoting the continuity and efficiency of the ARF process.

2. Roles and Procedures

(1) Definition of the ARF Chair
ARF Chair means the Minister for Foreign Affairs or its equivalent of the ARF Chair Country in the inter-sessional year. The ARF Chair could appoint a representative (such as the SOM Leader) to assist the Chair.

(2) Roles
The ARF Chair could perform a role in good offices and/or a role in co-ordination in between ARF meetings which includes:

a) Promoting confidence building among ARF members by facilitating information exchange and dialogue between and among ARF members, such as by holding conferences and workshops.

b) Fostering cooperation between ARF members by facilitating discussion on potential areas of cooperation.

c) Facilitating discussion on norms building in the ARF to enhance mutual trust and understanding.

d) Encouraging exchange of information and highlighting issues that can impact on regional security for consideration by the ARF by serving as a conduit for information sharing in between ARF meetings.

e) Serving as a focal point for consultations among ARF members on the basis of consensus of all the ARF members. Upon prior consent of directly involved states and the consensus of all ARF members, the ARF Chair may convene an ad hoc meeting of all ARF members at an appropriate level.

f) Liaising with external parties, such as heads of international organisations, and Track II organisations on an informal basis and with prior consultation with all ARF members and their consent.

(3) mechanism to Support the ARF Chair
The ARF should discuss an appropriate mechanism to support the ARF Chair so that the Chair can carry out the roles in good offices and co-ordination in between ARF
meetings smoothly and effectively. The following modalities of mechanism could be taken into consideration:

(a) The ARF Chair will be supported by the resources of its country as is the current practice.

(b) The ARF Chair could draw on the expertise and resources of other ARF members. In this context, a particular attention should be paid to the need to ensure effective continuity during a transition period of chairmanship.

(c) The ARF Chair could call upon the Experts and Eminent Persons (EEP) to provide their views on issues of relevance to their expertise in accordance with the Terms of Reference of EEP to be established with the consensus of all ARF members.

(d) The ARF Chair could draw on the expertise and resources of external parties and Track II organisations as far as this was undertaken informally with consent of ARF members.

(4) Reporting

The ARF Chair should report to all ARF members on its activities in a timely manner.
Co-Chairs Paper on the Terms of Reference for the ARF Experts/Eminent Person (EEPs)

The 71h ARF Senior Officials' Meeting in May 2000 agreed that "the ARF proceed with collating nominations of experts/eminent persons (EEPs) for the Register on a voluntary basis for submission. However, discussions on the terms of reference for the use of the Register would continue in the next inter-sessional year." The 7th ARF Ministerial Meeting in July 2000 also agreed that 'pending further discussions and agreement on the terms of reference for the Register, the ARF participants proceed with collating nominations of experts / eminent persons (EEPs) for the Register on a voluntary basis with the ARF Chair serving as a focal point."

Consistent with this request, the ARF ISG on CBMs of the 2000/2001 inter-sessional year should continue discussions on the terms of reference for the use of the Register while the ARF participants forward the list of their EEPs for the Register on a voluntary basis. The purpose of this paper is to generate further exchange of views among ARF participants on the development of an appropriate draft Terms of Reference for the EEPs.

1. Nomination on Experts/Eminent Persons
   (a) Each ARF participant can nominate, on a voluntary basis, up to five experts/eminent persons (EEPs), after having obtained their consent.
   (b) Each ARF participant may only nominate its own nationals to the Register. (In the case of the EU, it may nominate EEPs holding the nationality of any EU country). An ARF participant cannot veto the nominees of another ARF participant.

2. Contents of the Register
   (a) The Register should contain the following information on each EEP: name, nationality, contact details (address, phone/fax numbers, e-mail address, etc.), curriculum vitae, areas of expertise, as well as any additional information deemed relevant.

3. Management of the Register
   (a) The ARF Chair will manage the Register throughout each intersessional year. Copies of the Register should be made available during meetings of the ARF SOM and upon the request of any ARF participant.
   (b) ARF participants should keep the ARF Chair informed of any changes in the information regarding their respective nominees including the addition and/or withdrawal of an EEP. The ARF Chair will then update the Register accordingly.
4. Scope and Procedure for Activities of the EEPs

(a) The EEPs may provide non-binding and professional views or recommendations to the ARF participants, when they are requested to undertake in-depth studies and researches or serve as resource persons in ARF meetings on issues of relevance to their expertise.

(b) The ARF Chair or any ARF participant may propose to activate the EEPs for the above-mentioned tasks. Such proposals will be collected by the ARF Chair and circulated to all ARF participants. In the absence of any objection from concerned ARF participants the proposals will be put into effect.

(c) The activities and findings/results of the EEPs should be reported to the ARF Chair which would share it with all ARF participants. In this regard, the EEPs should be informed in advance on the way their findings/results will be used by the ARF chair or ARF participants.

5. Funding

(a) The ARF participants that engage the services of the EEPs will bear the costs involved.

(b) In the event that the EEPs are commissioned for a task by the initiative of the ARF Chair, the Chair may mobilize voluntary contributions from ARF participants. The modality of funding should be indicated in the proposals.

6. Future Review of the Terms of Reference

(a) These Terms of Reference for the use of the Register of EEPs will be reviewed for possible amendments and revisions when and if the need arises in the future. Any amendments and revisions shall be made on the basis of consensus of all ARF members.

The 71h ARF Senior Officials' Meeting in May 2000 agreed that "the ARF proceed with collating nominations of experts/eminent persons (EEPs) for the Register on a voluntary basis for submission However, discussions on the terms of reference for the use of the Register would continue in the next inter-sessional year." The 7th ARF Ministerial Meeting in July 2000 also agreed that 'pending further discussions and agreement on the terms of reference for the Register, the ARF participants proceed with collating nominations of experts / eminent persons (EEPs) for the Register on a voluntary basis with the ARF Chair serving as a focal point. "

Consistent with this request, the ARF ISG on CBMs of the 2000/2001 inter-sessional years should continue discussions on the terms of reference for the use of the Register while the ARF participants forward the list of their EEPs for the Register on a voluntary basis. The purpose of this paper is to generate further exchange of views among ARF participants on the development of an appropriate
draft Terms of Reference for the EEPs.

1. **Nomination on Experts/Eminent Persons**
(a) Each ARF participant can nominate, on a voluntary basis, up to five experts/ eminent persons (EEPs), after having obtained their consent.
(b) Each ARF participant may only nominate its own nationals to the Register. (In the case of the EU, it may nominate EEPs holding the nationality of any EU country). An ARF participant cannot veto the nominees of another ARF participant.

2. **Contents of the Register**
(a) The Register should contain the following information on each EEP: name, nationality, contact details (address, phone/fax numbers, e-mail address, etc.), curriculum vitae, areas of expertise, as well as any additional information deemed relevant.

3. **Management of the Register**
(a) The ARF Chair will manage the Register throughout each intersessional year. Copies of the Register should be made available during meetings of the ARF SOM and upon the request of any ARF participant.
(b) ARF participants should keep the ARF Chair informed of any changes in the information regarding their respective nominees including the addition and/or withdrawal of an EEP. The ARF Chair will then update the Register accordingly.

4. **Scope and Procedure for Activities of the EEPs**
(a) The EEPs may provide non-binding and professional views or recommendations to the ARF participants, when they are requested to undertake in-depth studies and researches or serve as resource persons in ARF meetings on issues of relevance to their expertise.
(b) The ARF Chair or any ARF participant may propose to activate the EEPs for the above-mentioned tasks. Such proposals will be collected by the ARF Chair and circulated to all ARF participants. In the absence of any objection from concerned ARF participants the proposals will be put into effect.
(c) The activities and findings/results of the EEPs should be reported to the ARF Chair which would share it with all ARF participants. In this regard, the EEPs should be informed in advance on the way their findings/results will be used by the ARF chair or ARF participants.

5. **Funding**
(a) The ARF participants that engage the services of the EEPs will bear the costs involved.
(b) In the event that the EEPs are commissioned for a task by the initiative of the ARF Chair, the Chair may mobilize voluntary contributions from ARF participants. The modality of funding should be indicated in the proposals.

6. Future Review of the Terms of Reference
(a) These Terms of Reference for the use of the Register of EEPs. will be reviewed for possible amendments and revisions when and if the need arises in the future. Any amendments and revisions shall be made on the basis of consensus of all ARF members.